

*Consultation and Coordination*

---

Background	321
Consultation	323
Public Involvement	323
Distribution List	329

---

## ***Consultation and Coordination***

---

During the preparation of the Glen Canyon Dam Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), input was actively solicited from a broad range of public constituencies as part of the ongoing public involvement process. These public constituencies for the Colorado River, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and Grand Canyon National Park include: academia, concessionaires, congressional delegations, environmental groups, fish and wildlife groups, general unaffiliated publics, seven Basin State governments, Indian Tribes, news media, power customers (represented by the Colorado River Energy Distributor's Association and individual power organizations), white-water rafters and guides, recreation groups, water users, and Colorado River Storage Project water and power entities.

This chapter summarizes public involvement during the Glen Canyon Dam EIS process and will serve as the Public Involvement Summary Report, in accordance with *Reclamation Instructions*.

---

### **BACKGROUND**

Glen Canyon Dam was completed in 1963 prior to the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Consequently, there was no requirement for an EIS on the project prior to construction.

In December 1982, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) published an environmental assessment (EA) and finding of no significant impact (FONSI) on the impacts of a proposed powerplant uprate and rewind project. Reclamation proceeded with the uprate and rewind project but agreed not to use the increased powerplant capacity for flows above 31,500 cubic feet per second until completion of a more comprehensive study.

### **Glen Canyon Environmental Studies**

Beginning in December 1982, Reclamation initiated the multiagency, interdisciplinary Glen Canyon Environmental Studies (GCES) at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to address the concerns of the public and other Federal and State agencies about possible negative effects of the operations of Glen Canyon Dam on the existing downstream environmental and recreational resources.

Numerous information activities were conducted during the GCES (1987-89):

- Department of the Interior briefings
- Environmental group briefings
- Congressional briefings
- Constituent review meetings
- News releases and media contacts
- Speeches
- Video briefings

### ***GCES Phase I***

Between 1982 and 1987, 39 technical reports were prepared evaluating terrestrial biology, aquatic biology, sediment and hydrology, recreation, and dam operations. These technical reports were consolidated into a final technical report, program summaries, and review reports. No studies were conducted regarding the economic impact of changes in dam operations. A team composed of interagency technical staff and key researchers completed the *GCES Final Report* in January 1988, (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1988) consolidating the results of the individual studies into a summary document.

An Executive Review Committee made up of policy level representatives from Reclamation, National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Department of the

Interior's Office of Environmental Project Review (now the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance), and Western Area Power Administration (Western) prepared a report containing recommendations and options for decision. Using technical data presented in the *GCES Final Report*, a review by the National Research Council, and individual management priorities, the review committee determined that additional studies were required before any changes in the operations at Glen Canyon Dam could be recommended. That decision was not unanimous.

### ***GCES Phase II***

After review of the *GCES Final Report* and committee recommendations, the Secretary directed Reclamation to initiate additional studies to gather more data on specific operational elements. This second effort, GCES Phase II, began in 1988. These studies assess the impacts of low and fluctuating flows and potential impacts to resources and power revenues. Various constituent groups were involved in review of the study plans.

An additional principal purpose of GCES Phase II is to provide scientific information as input to the EIS. Most of the research conducted or underway has facilitated the ability to describe the existing environment and the impacts of EIS alternatives on that environment.

On July 27, 1989, Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan announced that an EIS was to be prepared on the operation of Glen Canyon Dam. The Notice of Intent was published in the *Federal Register* on October 27, 1989.

With the decision to prepare an EIS, it became clear that the original timing for a 4- to 5-year Phase II effort would need to be condensed if the Phase II studies were to be effective in producing information for the EIS. Concern over shortening the research period was expressed. In establishing the timeframe for the EIS, the discussion centered on the conflict between the need for thorough (lengthy) research to completely answer the outstanding questions, the need for interim flows, and the need to complete the NEPA process in a timely manner.

In June 1990, research flows were implemented at Glen Canyon Dam. Following completion of the research flows on July 31, 1991, a 90-day test period of the proposed interim flow criteria was conducted from August 1 to October 31. This interim test period allowed Reclamation to more fully evaluate data gathered from research, determine the suitability of the proposed criteria to protect downstream resources, develop exception criteria, and comply with NEPA requirements before implementation.

An EA on the interim operating criteria was issued by Reclamation in October 1991. Since the proposed action did not constitute a major Federal action having significant effects on the quality of the human environment, a FONSI was determined appropriate and was signed on October 31, 1991.

Interim operating criteria were implemented by the Secretary on November 1, 1991, as a temporary measure designed to reduce adverse impacts on downstream resources until the EIS was completed and the record of decision (ROD) is implemented.

### **Cooperating Agencies**

Acting as lead agency, Reclamation requested the participation of cooperating agencies that either had jurisdiction by law or interest in certain aspects of Glen Canyon Dam operations or Colorado River resources below the dam. The cooperating agencies are listed below.

Department of the Interior  
 Bureau of Reclamation (lead agency)  
 Bureau of Indian Affairs  
 National Park Service  
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
 Department of Energy  
 Western Area Power Administration  
 Arizona Game and Fish Department  
 Hopi Tribe  
 Hualapai Tribe  
 Navajo Nation  
 San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe  
 Southern Paiute Consortium  
 Zuni Pueblo

This management-level coordinating group oversaw both the preparation of the EIS and the related GCES research activities.

A interagency, interdisciplinary team was formed to prepare the EIS. Representatives from Reclamation; NPS; FWS; Western; Arizona Game and Fish Department; U.S. Geological Survey; Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Navajo Nation; and a private consulting firm served on the EIS team. (See the list of preparers that follows this chapter.)

---

## CONSULTATION

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended in 1992) requires Federal agencies to consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation concerning potential effects of Federal actions on historic properties. Therefore, Reclamation, in conjunction with NPS, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, Indian Tribes, and the advisory council, developed a programmatic agreement on cultural properties that include identifying, monitoring, and protecting cultural sites potentially affected by Glen Canyon Dam operations (see attachment 5).

In compliance with the Endangered Species Act, Reclamation entered into formal consultation with FWS. FWS submitted a biological opinion on the preferred alternative that contained a finding of no jeopardy for the bald eagle, Kanab ambersnail, and peregrine falcon and a jeopardy finding for the humpback chub and razorback sucker. As required by the Endangered Species Act, the opinion contained a "reasonable and prudent alternative" that could remove the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence of the humpback chub and razorback sucker in Grand Canyon.

A proposed rule to list the southwestern willow flycatcher (a small bird) as endangered with critical habitat, was published in the *Federal Register* on July 23, 1993. A portion of the proposed critical habitat is within the area affected by releases from Glen Canyon Dam. The declining status of the species has been a concern to all the cooperating agencies and,

therefore, specific research and population monitoring has been a part of GCES—even prior to the proposed rule. This species and its critical habitat were considered in the assessment of impacts on vegetation and bird species.

Reclamation is informally conferencing with FWS, in accordance with the rules and regulations governing proposed species and proposed critical habitat. If this process indicates that operations under the preferred alternative would jeopardize the southwestern willow flycatcher or adversely modify its proposed critical habitat, Reclamation will formally conference with FWS on this species and will consult as necessary if the proposed rule results in listing the species.

Consultation with FWS under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) has been ongoing throughout the EIS process. The FWCA ensures that fish and wildlife receive equal consideration during planning and construction of Federal water projects. FWS prepares a FWCA report which contains nonbinding recommendations for actions that would be beneficial to fish and wildlife. FWS recommendations from the FWCA report and Reclamation's responses are included in attachment 4.

Since none of the alternatives include development in the flood plain as described in Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, this action complies with that order. Also, none of the alternatives include development that would affect wetlands. Therefore, the action contemplated here is in compliance with Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands. The marshes along the Colorado River in Glen and Grand Canyons are dynamic; some are destroyed and others created, depending on the actions of water and sediment.

---

## PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

One of the most important objectives of public involvement is to obtain information from a well-informed public to assist the decisionmaker (Secretary of the Interior) throughout the entire process, culminating in a ROD and eventual

implementation of the selected alternative. The three primary goals of the public involvement for this EIS were:

1. *Credibility*: creating an open and visible decisionmaking process for groups with highly divergent viewpoints
2. *Identifying public concerns and values*: providing a mechanism by which the involved agencies can understand the problems, issues, and possible solutions from the perspectives of the various publics
3. *Developing a consensus*: providing a process for reaching consensus about specific actions

In order to identify issues, address public concerns, obtain public input, and keep the public informed, Reclamation initiated an ongoing public involvement program when the decision to prepare an EIS was announced in July 1989. This program included meetings with local government officials, public scoping meetings, slide presentations, user group meetings and conferences, newsletters, news releases, participation of interested parties at cooperating agency meetings, and one-on-one contacts.

During preparation of this EIS, the cooperating agencies met at least every 3 months to review progress and to reach agreement on major issues. Interested parties were invited to attend these meetings as observers and, until May 1992, separate evening sessions were held for interested parties. From then on, time was allotted for questions from the audience during the cooperating agency meetings and evening sessions were discontinued.

## Scoping

During EIS preparation, the process of soliciting input from groups and individuals is called scoping. The purpose of scoping is to identify issues, criteria, and alternatives for analysis. The following section describes the major actions that occurred during the scoping process. In addition to these major actions, Reclamation initiated many meetings with individuals, environmental groups,

hydropower agencies, Indian Tribes, universities and colleges, and officials of local, State and Federal governments.

The formal public scoping period for the EIS began with a *Federal Register* notice on February 23, 1990, to receive public input on and determine the appropriate scope of the EIS, consistent with NEPA and its implementing regulations.

Eight public meetings were held between March 12 and April 3, 1990, in Salt Lake City, Denver, Phoenix, Flagstaff (two), Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, DC, to determine the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the EIS. These meetings were attended by about 1,400 people. Comments were presented by about 250 people, a few of whom spoke at more than one meeting.

The comment period was extended to May 4, 1990, and more than 17,000 written and oral scoping comments were received. Each original comment letter was read at least twice to better understand the issues, concerns, and suggestions expressed. These letters are on file in Reclamation's Upper Colorado Regional Office in Salt Lake City, Utah.

A scoping report was prepared by Bear West Consulting Team (Bureau of Reclamation, 1990b), a private business that assisted in public involvement activities. The report summarizes the comments received during the scoping process. The methods used by Bear West to code and summarize public comments were approved by the cooperating agencies.

Comments were summarized as issues or resources of concern in the following categories: beaches, endangered species, ecosystem, fish, electric power costs, electric power production, sediment, water conservation, rafting and boating, air quality, the Grand Canyon wilderness, and a category designated as "other" for remaining concerns. The comments regarding interests and values were categorized as: expressions about the Grand Canyon, economics, nonquantifiable values, nature versus human use, and the

complexity of Glen Canyon Dam issues (Bureau of Reclamation, 1990b). The following is a brief summary of these public comments.

### **Resources**

**Beaches.** The main concerns noted were erosion, degradation, and inadequacy of beaches. Causes of beaches deteriorating were identified as: fluctuating dam releases, the floods of 1983, the lack of sediment in the waters, and overuse by rafters and hikers. The replacement of native vegetation by non-native vegetation also was listed as a problem.

**Endangered Species.** The most common concern expressed was for the humpback chub, followed by the razorback sucker and willow flycatcher. Broad support for the protection of endangered species, especially fish and birds, was expressed. Comments also included requests that some efforts be made to restore the fish species now missing from the Colorado River in Grand Canyon.

**Ecosystem.** Some specific elements of the ecosystem identified as special concerns included wildlife, aquatic ecosystem, riparian community, waterfowl, wetlands, and the food chain. Comments were made that it was time to return the ecosystem to a more natural condition. Many felt that the integrity of the ecosystem needed to be given priority over power generation considerations and that fluctuating flows were the main source of ecosystem damage.

**Fish.** The trout fishery below the dam was an area of concern. The main comment was that the fish are being killed by fluctuating flows and that the dam could be managed in a manner more supportive of the fishery. The major concern was fish stranding—particularly of spawning fish—that occurs during low flows. It was also mentioned that native fish have been or are being lost. According to the comments, much of the problem centers on water temperature. Other problems identified were danger to anglers caused by fluctuating water levels and ramp rates, lack of angler access to certain areas during low flows,

problems controlling striped bass, and the possibility that current regulations allow overfishing.

**Power Costs.** The most frequent comments were that the present cost of power generated at the dam represents a subsidy and that market rates should be charged and adjusted seasonally. Others flatly denied that any subsidy was involved. It was suggested that an independent audit is needed to determine the true operating costs of the Colorado River Storage Project and to determine whether or not a subsidy is actually occurring. Maintaining access to low-cost power was particularly important to people in rural areas. It was also suggested that conservation measures are vital to keeping power costs down.

**Power Production.** The most frequent comment regarding power production was that power resources do not or should not have priority over other resources. Others claimed that peaking power operations were causing severe damage to downstream resources. Comments encouraged study of alternatives that would reduce the need for peaking power production at the dam. According to some, contracts for firm power sales should be based only on the 8.23 million acre-feet annual water release requirement, and increasing the power generation capacity at Hoover Dam should be studied.

Those who argued against changes in dam operation stated that hydropower is critical to the economic development and general well-being of the rural Southwest. Power customers believe that hydropower is compatible with the environment and that alternative power sources pose environmental problems of their own. Those who use power produced by the dam fear they will bear the brunt of operational changes at the dam and feel that their needs should be given equal consideration with environmental protection.

**Sediment.** Many comments suggested that, because most sediment is being trapped behind the dam, the downstream sediment needs to be augmented and conserved. Many comments claimed that a great deal of existing sediment is carried away in high flows and deposited at the

upper end of Lake Mead, making access upriver impossible for power boats. Caution was raised that any sediment used for augmentation must be studied for toxic elements that would damage the system instead of helping it.

**Water Conservation.** Those commenting recognized the need for water conservation. The major concern was that changes in dam operation could affect water allocation deliveries and place undue burdens on irrigation users.

**Rafting and Boating.** Some argued that flows since the construction of the dam are more reliable and enhance boating, but others said that dam operations are making the boating experience less pleasant and even hazardous. Also, increased beach erosion has resulted in fewer beaches for camping. Others felt that the beaches are overused, the number of permits should be reduced, and the size of groups should be carefully regulated.

**Air Quality.** Most comments referred to the decrease in visibility caused by air pollution affecting Grand Canyon. Concern was expressed that pollution might get worse if alternatives to hydropower are used.

**Grand Canyon Wilderness.** Most of the comments made about Grand Canyon wilderness centered on the desire to promote the long-term well-being of the canyon and its resources. While some pointed out that recreational use is causing damage, others considered this damage minor compared to the damage caused by power production.

**Other Concerns.** The variety of comments in this category included statements that dam operations adversely affect recreational and other resources and that the reservoir is filling up with silt. Some felt that removing the dam ought to be a choice. Concern also was expressed about the value of archeological and anthropological ruins and cultural resources.

## **Social Values**

**Expressions about Grand Canyon.** The national and international significance of Grand Canyon was the focus of most comments in this category. A deep love and concern was expressed for its beauty and the intangible benefits to those who view it, hike in it, and raft through it. The preservation of the fragile canyon for future generations was felt to be worth any cost associated with it—especially the cost associated with changing power production methods.

**Economics.** Several economic issues were identified. First, it was noted that little attention has been given to the economic contributions of power customers to the environmental studies. Second, it was suggested that the economic tradeoffs involved in these issues be thoroughly studied. Third, it was noted that environmental damage has been the price paid in the past for cheap power and that we now face a choice between higher power costs or continued environmental damage. The economic value of tourism in the canyon and the profitability of the rafting industry both were acknowledged. It was suggested that nonprofit (public power) agencies should be given more priority in power allocations than profit-making ones, since the dam was built using public funds. Some comments stated that the cost of power should be the last consideration in deciding on dam management and that protecting the canyon is worth any price. Others said that the result of the benefit/cost process should be the greatest benefit at the lowest societal cost.

**Nonquantifiable Values.** The majority of comments expressed that environmental awareness and a desire to preserve natural resources are increasing in this country. While some noted that the dam has had some positive environmental effects, others expressed the feeling that building the dam and flooding Glen Canyon was a major mistake. Some stated that natural resources have a finite capacity for intrusion, but others emphasized that while wise use of resources is necessary, we should use them.

**Nature Versus Human Use.** Most of the comments in this area centered on people tampering with the environment using imperfect knowledge and creating problems which then must be solved. Those commenting felt that interference with the delicate ecosystem of Grand Canyon is no exception. Others pointed out that man's interference with Grand Canyon is insignificant when compared to the natural, historic changes that have taken place there.

**Complexity of Issues.** The fact that the issues to be studied as part of the EIS process, including the canyon, are very complex and interrelated was reflected in all comments on this issue. The EIS was described as a complex balancing act.

### Summary of Public Meetings on Preliminary Alternatives

As a result of scoping, it was apparent that the issues and potential alternatives were diverse, and compromise and consensus would be difficult to reach.

Following the formal public scoping period and review of the comments, representatives from the cooperating agencies and public interest groups met in July 1990 to determine criteria for developing reasonable alternatives for the EIS. These criteria included:

- Be consistent with the scope of the EIS
- Be economically and technically feasible
- Reflect legal considerations
- Have general institutional acceptability
- Be timely to implement
- Be able to be monitored and adjusted
- Meet various agency mandates
- Be supported by data
- Be multipurpose (integrated) and not eliminate any major resources
- Include mitigation

The EIS team reviewed the scoping comments with the concept of reasonableness in mind and, using the above criteria, formulated 10 preliminary alternatives. All reasonable concerns expressed during the scoping process were treated

fairly and objectively in order to produce an array of alternatives for the EIS. The 10 preliminary alternatives provided a wide range of possible flow patterns and supporting actions in response to public issues and concerns.

The EIS team presented the 10 preliminary alternatives to the public for review and comment before preparing the EIS. These preliminary alternatives were summarized in a newsletter sent in mid-March 1991 to about 20,000 addressees. Three public meetings were held to explain the preliminary alternatives, to respond to questions, and to solicit comments. These meetings were held in Salt Lake City, Utah; Flagstaff, Arizona; and Phoenix, Arizona. The public was notified of these meetings through the local news media and an announcement in the *Federal Register*. The public comment period on the alternatives ran from April 1 to May 1, 1991.

The public was informed that the alternatives judged to be "reasonable" would be subjected to detailed analysis in the EIS. Those determined to be not reasonable would be briefly identified in the EIS, but eliminated from further study. The public was asked to use the above criteria and determine the "reasonableness" of the alternatives; general views and comments also were accepted.

The EIS team received 456 letters—112 from organizations and 344 from private individuals. These letters were reviewed and categorized by the Bear West Consulting Team and summarized in the *Glen Canyon Dam Environmental Impact Statement Preliminary Alternatives Report, April–May 1991* (Bureau of Reclamation, 1991b).

The predominant public comment was the need for "operation only" alternatives or separate analysis of the operation and nonoperational measures rather than the complete package approach. A list of other comments most frequently voiced can be found in chapter II under "Process Used to Formulate Alternatives."



## Alternatives Selected for Detailed Analysis

The EIS team reviewed the public comments on the preliminary alternatives. That review and early technical analysis allowed the EIS team to reduce the alternatives studied in detail from 10 to 7 for analysis.

These seven alternatives were presented to the cooperating agencies and to interested parties at a meeting in Phoenix on September 16–18, 1991. A synopsis of these alternatives was distributed to more than 19,000 people in a January 1992 newsletter. The EIS team subsequently formulated two additional alternatives in order to present a full range of reasonable operations.

## Public Review of Draft EIS

The draft EIS was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency on January 4, a press conference announcing its release was held on January 6, and a *Federal Register* notice was published on January 7, 1994. National television networks, as well as many newspapers in the seven Basin States and local television and radio stations in Phoenix, Flagstaff, and Salt Lake City, announced the release of the draft EIS.

The entire three-volume draft EIS was mailed to those on the distribution list in this chapter. In addition, the 65-page summary volume was distributed to over 17,000 interested parties on the *Colorado River Studies Office Newsletter* mailing list. Reclamation received over 1,000 requests for either the entire draft EIS or the summary volume after the initial distribution.

The public review process was designed to build upon the substantial public involvement established throughout the EIS process. Three public information sessions and two briefings on the EIS were conducted. Seven public hearings were held to accept comments.

## Public Information Sessions

In February 1994, prior to public hearings, Reclamation hosted three public information

sessions in Salt Lake City, Phoenix, and Flagstaff. The sessions provided the public with an opportunity to learn more about the EIS. Members of the interagency EIS team presented displays and were available to answer questions and to discuss how the alternatives would affect the resources of Grand Canyon. The purpose of these sessions was to provide information and answer questions, not to receive official comments on the draft EIS. In addition to the information sessions, two briefings were conducted in the Washington, DC area—one on Capitol Hill and one in Arlington, Virginia.

Advance notice of the sessions was announced in the newsletter, and press releases were sent to newspapers and radio and TV stations in the involved areas. Personal letters of invitation were sent to members of Congress from the seven Basin States, specific congressional committees, and Governors of Arizona and Utah.

## Public Hearings

Public hearings to accept oral comments on the draft EIS were held during March 1994 in Los Angeles and San Francisco, California; Phoenix and Flagstaff, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah; Washington, DC; and Arlington, Virginia. The Department of the Interior provided a solicitor to preside over the hearings, and two officials from Reclamation familiar with the draft EIS also participated. All oral comments were recorded verbatim by a court recorder and became part of the official record.

## Public Comments

The official comment period on the draft EIS began on January 7, 1994, and was concluded on April 11, 1994. In addition, comments received for more than a month after the close of the official comment period were accepted to ensure that all comments received within reasonable timeframe would be reviewed for the final EIS.

Over 33,000 written comments as well as the oral comments received during the public hearings were reviewed and analyzed by Reclamation officials and the Bear West Consulting Team.

More than 2,300 separate concerns, issues, or opinions were extracted from the comment analysis. A summary of the comments and responses is presented in the "Comments and Responses" volume of this document.

The "Public Comments Analysis Report" prepared by the Bear West Consulting Team (Bureau of Reclamation, 1994b), responses prepared by the EIS team, all public comments, and the public hearing transcripts are filed with the Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office, Salt Lake City, Utah, as part of the official record.

---

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

### Copies Distributed by Commissioner's Office, Washington, DC

#### *Federal Agencies*

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (2)  
 Department of Agriculture  
   Forest Service (2)  
   Soil Conservation Service (2)  
 Department of Army, Corps of Engineers (5)  
 Department of Commerce (8)  
 Department of Energy (2)  
   Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2)  
   Western Area Power Administration  
 Department of Health and Human Services (6)  
 Department of Housing and Urban  
   Development (7)  
 Department of the Interior  
   Bureau of Indian Affairs (2)  
   Bureau of Land Management (2)  
   Bureau of Mines (2)  
   Fish and Wildlife Service (3)  
   Geological Survey (3)  
   National Park Service (5)  
   Natural Resources Library (3)  
   Office of Environmental Policy and  
     Compliance (5)  
 Department of Transportation (2)  
 Environmental Protection Agency (5)  
 International Boundary and Water Commission (2)  
 Office of Management and Budget

### *Congressional Delegations*

All Senators and Representatives from the seven Colorado River Basin States:

Arizona  
 California  
 Colorado  
 Nevada  
 New Mexico  
 Utah  
 Wyoming

### Copies Distributed by Upper Colorado Regional Office, Salt Lake City, Utah

#### *Federal Agencies*

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation,  
 Golden, Colorado  
 Council on Environmental Policy,  
 Washington, DC  
 Department of Agriculture  
   Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation  
     Service, Phoenix, Arizona; Sacramento,  
     California  
   Extension Service, Tucson, Arizona; Oakland,  
     California  
   Forest Service, Southwestern Region,  
     Albuquerque, New Mexico  
   Soil Conservation Service, West National  
     Technical Center, Portland, Oregon;  
     Phoenix, Arizona; Davis, California  
 Department of the Army  
   Corps of Engineers, Southwestern Division,  
     Dallas, Texas; Salt Lake City, Utah; Phoenix,  
     Arizona  
 Department of Energy  
   Department of Energy, Albuquerque, New Mexico  
   Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,  
     San Francisco, California  
   Western Area Power Administration,  
     Sacramento, California; Golden and  
     Loveland, Colorado; Salt Lake City, Utah;  
     Phoenix, Arizona  
 Department of Health and Human Services,  
 San Francisco, California  
 Department of the Interior  
   Bureau of Indian Affairs, Phoenix, Arizona;  
     Carson City, Nevada; Albuquerque and  
     Farmington, New Mexico; Hopi Agency,  
     Keams Canyon, Arizona; Navajo Area Office,

- Gallup, New Mexico; Southern Paiute Field Station, St. George, Utah; Truxton Canon Agency, Valentine, Arizona  
Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Havasu City and Phoenix, Arizona; Denver and Lakewood, Colorado; Sacramento, California  
Bureau of Mines (Research Center), Salt Lake City, Utah  
Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Phoenix, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah; Denver, Colorado  
Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California; Salt Lake City, Utah; Tucson and Flagstaff, Arizona; Arvada and Boulder, Colorado; Cheyenne, Wyoming; Reston, Virginia  
National Biological Service, Fort Collins, Colorado  
National Park Service, San Francisco, California; Denver and Fort Collins, Colorado; Flagstaff, Arizona; Canyonlands National Park, Moab, Utah; Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Page, Arizona; Grand Canyon National Park, Grand Canyon, Arizona; Gunnison National Monument, Gunnison, Colorado; Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Boulder City, Nevada; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Office of the Regional Solicitor, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Office of the Field Solicitor, Phoenix, Arizona  
Office of Surface Mining, Denver, Colorado  
Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration, Phoenix, Arizona  
Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, Denver, Colorado; Region IX, San Francisco, California
- State Government Agencies**
- Arizona State Government, Phoenix  
Governor  
Environmental Quality, Department of  
Game and Fish Department  
State Clearinghouse, Commerce Department (10 copies)  
State Historic Preservation Officer, Arizona  
State Parks  
Water Resources Department
- California State Government, Sacramento  
Governor  
Colorado River Board of California, Glendale  
State Clearinghouse (10 copies)  
Water Resources Control Board
- Colorado State Government, Denver  
Governor  
State Clearinghouse, Division of Local Government (10 copies)  
Water Conservation Board
- Nevada State Government, Carson City  
Governor  
Colorado River Commission of Nevada  
Division of Environmental Protection  
State Clearinghouse, Department of Administration (10 copies)
- New Mexico State Government, Santa Fe  
Governor  
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department  
Environment Department  
Game and Fish, Department of  
Interstate Stream Commission  
State Engineer  
(no State Clearinghouse)
- Utah State Government, Salt Lake City  
Governor  
Energy Division  
Natural Resources, Department of  
State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Budget (19 copies)  
Water Resources, Division of  
Wildlife Resources, Division of
- Wyoming State Government, Cheyenne  
Governor  
Environmental Quality Department  
State Clearinghouse, State Planning Coordinator's Office (20 copies)  
State Engineer

**Indian Tribes**

Havasupai Tribe, Supai, Arizona  
 Hopi Tribe, Kykotsmobi Village, Arizona  
 Hualapai Tribe, Peach Springs, Arizona  
 Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Pipe Spring, Arizona  
 Navajo Nation, Window Rock, Arizona  
 Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Cedar City, Utah  
 San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Shivwits Paiute Tribe, Ivins, Utah  
 Southern Paiute Consortium, Fredonia, Arizona  
 Zuni Pueblo, Zuni, New Mexico

**Libraries****Arizona**

Arizona Department of Water Resources Library, Phoenix  
 Arizona State Library, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records, Phoenix  
 Arizona State Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Phoenix  
 Arizona State University, Noble Science and Engineering Library; Hayden Library, Tempe  
 Flagstaff City-Coconino County Public Library, Flagstaff  
 Grand Canyon Community Library, Grand Canyon  
 Maricopa County Library, Phoenix  
 Mesa Public Library, Mesa  
 Mohave County Library/Kingman Public Library, Kingman  
 Northern Arizona University, Cline Library, Flagstaff  
 Page Public Library, Page  
 Phoenix City Library, Phoenix  
 Scottsdale Public Library, Scottsdale  
 Tempe Public Library, Tempe  
 Tucson Public Library, Tucson  
 University of Arizona Library, Tucson

**California**

California State Library, Sacramento  
 California State University, Hayward Library, Hayward  
 California State University, University Library, Los Angeles  
 Colorado River Board of California Library, Glendale

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX Library, San Francisco  
 Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles  
 Los Angeles Public Library, Water and Power Section, Los Angeles  
 San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco  
 Stanford University Libraries, Stanford  
 University of California, General Library, Berkeley  
 University of California, Shields Library, Davis  
 University of California, University Research Library, Los Angeles  
 University of Southern California, Doheny Memorial Library, Los Angeles

**Colorado**

Colorado State University Libraries, Fort Collins  
 Denver Central Library, Denver  
 Fort Lewis College Library, Durango  
 Montrose Public Library, Montrose  
 University of Colorado at Boulder, Norlin Library, Boulder  
 University of Denver, Penrose Library, Denver  
 U.S. Air Force Academy, Academy Library, Colorado Springs

**Nevada**

Boulder City Library, Boulder City  
 Clark County Library District, Las Vegas  
 Nevada State Library, Carson City  
 University of Nevada at Las Vegas, James Dickinson Library, Las Vegas  
 University of Nevada, Reno Library, Reno

**New Mexico**

Albuquerque Public Library, Albuquerque  
 New Mexico State Library, Santa Fe  
 New Mexico State University, Las Cruces  
 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

**Utah**

Brigham Young University, Harold B. Lee Library, Provo  
 Cedar City Public Library, Cedar City  
 Kanab City Library, Kanab  
 Moab Public Library, Moab  
 Salt Lake City Public Library, Salt Lake City  
 Salt Lake County Library System, Salt Lake City  
 Southern Utah State University Library, Cedar City

Uintah County Library, Vernal  
University of Utah, Marriott Library, Salt Lake City  
Utah State Library, Salt Lake City  
Utah State University, Merrill Library, Logan  
Washington County Library, St. George  
Weber State University, Stewart Library, Ogden

#### Wyoming

Laramie County Library System, Cheyenne  
Rock Springs Public Library, Rock Springs  
University of Wyoming, Coe Library, Laramie  
Wyoming State Library, Cheyenne

#### Other States (alphabetical by State)

Auburn University at Montgomery Library,  
Montgomery, Alabama  
University of Alabama, Amelia Gayle Gorgas  
Library, Tuscaloosa, Alabama  
Alaska State Library, Juneau, Alaska  
Arkansas State Library, Little Rock, Arkansas  
Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut

District of Columbia Public Library,  
Washington, DC  
Library of Congress, Washington, DC  
Library Program Service, Government Printing  
Office, Washington, DC  
Washington Highlands Library, Washington, DC  
University of Florida Libraries, Gainesville,  
Florida

University of Georgia Libraries, Athens, Georgia  
University of Hawaii, Hamilton Library,  
Honolulu, Hawaii  
University of Idaho Library, Moscow, Idaho  
Illinois State Library, Springfield, Illinois  
Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Indiana

University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City, Iowa  
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas  
University of Kentucky Libraries, Lexington,  
Kentucky  
Louisiana State University, Middleton Library,  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana  
Louisiana Technical University, Prescott  
Memorial Library, Ruston, Louisiana

University of Maine, Raymond H. Fogler  
Library, Orono, Maine  
University of Maryland, Hombake Library,  
College Park, Maryland  
Boston Public Library, Boston, Massachusetts  
Williams College Library, Williamstown,  
Massachusetts  
Detroit Public Library, Detroit, Michigan  
Library of Michigan, Lansing, Michigan

University of Minnesota, Wilson Library,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
University of Mississippi, J.D. Williams Library,  
University, Mississippi  
University of Missouri at Columbia, Ellis  
Library, Columbia, Missouri  
University of Montana, Maurene and Mike  
Mansfield Library, Missoula, Montana  
University of Nebraska—Lincoln, D.L. Love  
Memorial Library, Lincoln, Nebraska

Newark Public Library, Newark, New Jersey  
New York State Library, Albany, New York  
New York Public Library, New York,  
New York  
Research Libraries, New York, New York  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

North Dakota State University Library, Fargo,  
North Dakota  
State Library of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio  
Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma  
City, Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State University, Edmon Low Library,  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
Portland State University, Millar Library,  
Portland, Oregon

State Library of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg,  
Pennsylvania  
Clemson University, Cooper Library, Clemson,  
South Carolina  
Memphis State University Libraries, Memphis,  
Tennessee  
Texas State Library, Austin, Texas  
Texas Technical University Library, Lubbock,  
Texas

University of Virginia, Alderman Library,  
Charlottesville, Virginia  
Washington State Library, Olympia,  
Washington  
West Virginia University Library, Morgantown,  
West Virginia  
State Historical Society of Wisconsin Library,  
Madison, Wisconsin  
Milwaukee Public Library, Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin

### ***Scientific Oversight and Review***

National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC  
National Research Council, Washington, DC

### ***Interested Organizations***

Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia,  
Pennsylvania  
Adobe Whitewater Club, Santa Fe, New Mexico  
Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc., Phoenix,  
Arizona  
Ak-Chin Indian Community, Maricopa, Arizona  
American Bass Association, Inc., Wetumpka,  
Alabama; Pueblo, Colorado  
  
American Conservation Association, Inc.,  
New York, New York  
American Farm Bureau Federation,  
Washington, DC; Park Ridge, Illinois  
American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland;  
Olympia, Washington; McCall, Idaho;  
Albuquerque, New Mexico  
American Hiking Society, Washington, DC  
American League of Anglers and Boaters,  
Washington, DC  
  
American Public Power Association, Arlington,  
Virginia  
American Recreation Coalition, Washington, DC  
American Resources Group, Vienna, Virginia  
American Rivers, Washington, DC  
American Rivers Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona  
  
American Trails, Washington, DC  
American Water Resources Association, Bethesda,  
Maryland  
American Whitewater Affiliates, Washington, DC  
American Wildlands, Englewood, Colorado  
Americans for the Environment, Washington, DC

Animas - LaPlata Water Conservancy District,  
Durango, Colorado  
Argonne National Laboratory, Lakewood,  
Colorado; Argonne, Illinois  
Arizona Conservation Council, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Energy Office, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Ethnobotanical Research Association,  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Arizona Hydrological Society, Flagstaff, Arizona  
Arizona Municipal Power Users Association,  
Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Municipal Water Users, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Nature Conservancy, Tucson, Arizona  
Arizona Parks and Recreation Association,  
Phoenix, Arizona

Arizona Parks and Recreation Council,  
Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Power Administration, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Power Authority, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona Power Pooling Association, Phoenix and  
Mesa, Arizona  
Arizona Public Service (Federal Affairs),  
Washington, DC

Arizona Raft Adventures, Flagstaff, Arizona  
Arizona River Runners, Phoenix, Arizona  
Arizona State University, Center for  
Environmental Studies, Tempe, Arizona  
Arizona Whitewater Association, Tempe, Arizona  
Arizona Wilderness Coalition, Phoenix, Arizona

Arizona Wildlife Federation, Mesa, Arizona  
Arizonans' Wild and Scenic Rivers, Cortaro,  
Arizona  
Aspen Environmental Group, Agoura Hills,  
California  
Association of Bay Area Governments, Oakland,  
California  
Audubon Society (*see National Audubon Society*)  
Coordinating Counsel of Utah, Clearfield, Utah  
Maricopa, Phoenix, Arizona  
Napa-Sonoma, Napa, California  
Northern Arizona, Flagstaff and Sedona, Arizona  
Prescott, Prescott, Arizona  
Yosemite Area Chapter, Mariposa, California

- Bard Water District, Winterhaven, California  
Beaver City, Utah  
Boulder City Electrical Distribution Department,  
Boulder City, Nevada  
Bountiful City Light and Power Department,  
Bountiful, Utah  
Bridger Valley Electric Association, Mountain  
View, Wyoming
- California Chapter Bass Federation, Stockton,  
California  
California Energy Commission, Sacramento,  
California  
California Farm Bureau Federation, Sacramento,  
California  
California Natural Resources Federation,  
Berkeley, California  
California Trout, Inc., San Francisco, California
- California Wilderness Coalition, Davis, California  
California Wildlife Federation, Sacramento,  
California  
Canoe Cruisers Association, Arlington, Virginia  
Canyon and Rivers Environment, Flagstaff,  
Arizona  
Canyon Explorations, Flagstaff, Arizona
- Canyoneers, Inc., Flagstaff, Arizona  
Center for Environmental Information, Inc.,  
Rochester, New York  
Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research,  
Evanston, Illinois  
Central Arizona Paddlers Club, Phoenix, Arizona  
Central Arizona Project Association,  
Phoenix, Arizona
- Central Arizona Water Conservation District,  
Phoenix, Arizona  
Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Orem,  
Utah  
Clean Water Action, Washington, DC;  
Houston, Texas  
Coachella Valley Water District, Coachella,  
California  
Coconino County Parks and Recreation  
Association, Flagstaff, Arizona
- Coconino Sportsmen, Flagstaff, Arizona  
Colorado River and Trail Expeditions, Inc.,  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum,  
Bountiful, Utah  
Colorado River Energy Distributors Association,  
Salt Lake City, Utah; Phoenix, Arizona  
Colorado River Front Property Owners, Mohave  
Valley, Arizona
- Colorado River Resources Coalition, Salt Lake  
City, Utah; Desert Hot Springs, California  
Colorado River Water Conservation District,  
Glenwood Springs, Colorado  
Colorado River Wildlife Council, Salt Lake City,  
Utah  
Colorado Springs, City of; Utilities Department,  
Colorado Springs, Colorado  
Colorado Water Congress, Denver, Colorado
- Colorado Whitewater Association, Boulder,  
Colorado  
Columbus Electric Coop, Inc., Deming,  
New Mexico  
Commission on the Arizona Environment,  
Phoenix, Arizona  
Conservation Foundation, the, Washington, DC  
Continental Divide Electric Cooperative, Grants,  
New Mexico
- Cooperative Wilderness Handicapped Outdoor  
Group, Pocatello, Idaho  
Cortaro Marana Irrigation District, Marana,  
Arizona  
Council for Planning and Conservation, Beverly  
Hills, California  
CSWTA, Inc., Tuba City, Arizona  
Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, DC; Tucson,  
Arizona
- Desert Flycasters, Chandler, Arizona  
Diamond River Adventures, Page, Arizona  
Dixie Escalante Rural Electric Association,  
St. George, Utah; Beryl, Utah  
Dolores Water Conservancy District, Cortez,  
Colorado  
Ducks Unlimited, Inc., Memphis, Tennessee

- Ecological Society of America, the, Bethesda, Maryland  
 Ecology Center of Southern California, Los Angeles, California  
 EcoPlan Associates, Inc., Mesa, Arizona  
 Electrical District No. 3, Stanfield, Arizona  
 Emery Water Conservancy District, Castle Dale, Utah
- Enterprise, City of; Utah  
 Environmental Action Foundation, Inc., Washington, DC  
 Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Washington, DC  
 Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., New York, New York; Oakland, California; Boulder, Colorado; Austin, Texas  
 Environmental Law Institute, Washington, DC
- Environmental Policy Institute, Washington, DC  
 Farmington, City of; New Mexico  
 Federation of Fly Fishers, West Yellowstone, Montana  
 Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Seattle, Washington  
 Five County Association of Governments, St. George, Utah
- Flagstaff, City of; Arizona  
 Flowell Electrical Association, Inc., Fillmore, Utah  
 Flowing Wells Irrigation District, Tucson, Arizona  
 Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, Cody, Wyoming  
 Friends of Arizona Rivers, Phoenix, Arizona
- Friends of the Colorado River, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Friends of the River, Inc. (and Foundation), San Francisco and Sacramento, California  
 Fund for Animals, Inc., The, New York, New York  
 Garkane Power Association, Richfield, Utah  
 Global Walk for a Livable World, Madison, Wisconsin
- Grand Canyon Expeditions, Kanab, Utah  
 Grand Canyon Natural History Association, Grand Canyon, Arizona  
 Grand Canyon River Guides Association, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Grand Canyon Trust, Washington, DC; Flagstaff and Phoenix, Arizona  
 Hatch River Expedition, Salt Lake City, Utah
- Helix Water District, La Mesa, California  
 High Country River Rafters, Golden, Colorado  
 Highline Electrical Association, Holyoke, Colorado  
 Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District, Coolidge, Arizona  
 Holiday River Expeditions, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah
- Hurricane Power Association, Richfield, Utah  
 Hyrum, City of; Utah  
 Imperial Irrigation District, Imperial, California  
 Intermountain Consumer Power Association, Sandy, Utah  
 Intertribal Council of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona
- Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., The, Arlington, Virginia; California Division, San Pedro, California; Prescott, Arizona  
 Kanab, City of; Utah  
 Kaysville City, Utah  
 Land, Wildlife & Heritage Program Conservation Foundation, Washington, DC  
 Las Vegas Valley Water District, Las Vegas, Nevada
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California  
 League of Conservation Voters, Washington, DC  
 League of Women Voters of the U.S., Washington, DC; Sacramento, California  
 Logan City Light and Power, Logan, Utah  
 Los Alamos, County of; Department of Public Utilities, Los Alamos, New Mexico
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles, California  
 Maricopa Water District, Waddell, Arizona  
 Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles, California  
 Moki Mac River Expedition, Salt Lake City, Utah  
 Monroe City Corporation, Monroe, Utah
- Morgan City Corporation, Morgan, Utah  
 Mothers for Clean Waters, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona  
 Mountainview Electric Association, Inc., Limon, Colorado  
 Murray City Corporation, Murray, Utah  
 Murray City Power, Murray, Utah



- National Association of Conservation Districts,  
Washington, DC; Western Region, Lakewood,  
Colorado
- National Audubon Society, New York, New York;  
Washington, DC; Boulder, Colorado; Sacramento,  
California
- National Boating Federation, Washington, DC
- National Ecology Research Center, Fort Collins,  
Colorado
- National Indian Policy Center, Washington, DC
- National Organization for River Sports, Boulder  
and Colorado Springs, Colorado
- National Park Foundation, Washington, DC
- National Parks and Conservation Association,  
Washington, DC; Cottonwood and Tucson,  
Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah
- National Rural Electric Cooperative Association,  
Washington, DC
- National Water Resources Association, Arlington,  
Virginia
- National Wetlands Technical Council,  
Washington, DC
- National Wildlife Federation, Washington, DC;  
Sacramento, California; Ft. Carson, Colorado
- Natural Resources Council of America,  
Washington, DC
- Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.,  
New York, New York; San Francisco, California
- Nature Conservancy, The, Arlington, Virginia;  
San Francisco, California; Boulder, Colorado
- Nature's Own, Nederland, Colorado
- Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance,  
Arizona
- Navopache Electric Coop, Inc., Lakeside, Arizona
- Nevada Power Company, Las Vegas, Nevada
- Nevada Wildlife Federation, Reno, Nevada
- North American Lake Management Society,  
Alachua, Florida
- Northern Arizona Council of Governments,  
Flagstaff, Arizona
- Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District,  
Loveland, Colorado
- O.A.R.S., Inc., Angels Camp, California
- Page Electric Utility, Page, Arizona
- Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, California
- Pioneer Irrigation District, Caldwell, Idaho
- Plains Electric Generation & Transmission  
Coop, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico
- Platte River Power Authority, Fort Collins,  
Colorado
- Quartzsite, Town of, Arizona
- Queen Creek Irrigation District, Queen Creek,  
Arizona
- Rancho California Water District, Temecula,  
California
- Resources for the Future, Washington, DC
- River Trips, Flagstaff, Arizona
- Roosevelt Irrigation District, Buckeye, Arizona
- Salt River Project, Phoenix, Arizona
- Santa Clara, City of, Utah
- San Tan Irrigation District, Chandler Heights,  
Arizona
- Shipley Associates, Bountiful, Utah
- Sierra Club, San Francisco, California;  
Washington, DC; Los Angeles, California;  
Boulder, Colorado; Salt Lake City, Utah; Phoenix,  
Arizona; Flagstaff, Arizona
- Sierra Legal Defense Fund, Denver, Colorado
- Silver State Power Association, Pahrump, Nevada
- Sobek's White Water Rafting, Angels Camp,  
California
- Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy  
District, Pueblo, Colorado
- Southeastern Utah Association of Local  
Governments, Price, Utah
- Southwest Parks & Monuments Association,  
Tucson, Arizona
- Southwestern Electric Coop, Inc., Clayton,  
New Mexico
- Southwestern Water Conservation District,  
Durango, Colorado
- Springville City Corporation, Springville, Utah
- St. George Water and Power Board, St. George,  
Utah

Strawberry Electric Service District, Payson, Utah  
 Taxpayers for the Animas River, Durango,  
 Colorado  
 Thatcher, Town of; Arizona  
 Timber Resources Information Program,  
 Edgewater, Colorado  
 Tour West, Inc., Orem, Utah

Tri-State Generation and Transmission  
 Association, Inc., Denver, Colorado  
 Trout Unlimited, Vienna, Virginia;  
 Rocky Mountain Region, Wheat Ridge, Colorado;  
 West Coast Region, Fairfax, California; Arizona  
 Council, Flagstaff, Glendale, and Phoenix, Arizona;  
 California Council, Huntington Beach, California;  
 Utah Council, West Valley, Utah  
 Truth or Consequences, City of; New Mexico  
 Tucson Active Management Area, Tucson, Arizona  
 Tucson, City of; Tucson Water Department,  
 Tucson, Arizona

Tucson Rod & Gun Club, Tucson, Arizona  
 Upper Colorado River Commission, Denver,  
 Colorado; Salt Lake City, Utah; Santa Fe,  
 New Mexico  
 Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy  
 District, Gunnison, Colorado  
 U.S. Canoe and Kayak Team, Bethesda,  
 Maryland  
 Utah Energy Office, Salt Lake City, Utah

Utah Farm Bureau Federation, Salt Lake City, Utah  
 Utah Municipal Power Agency, Spanish  
 Fork, Utah  
 Utah Power and Light, Salt Lake City, Utah  
 Utah Water Users Association, Bountiful, Utah  
 Utah Wilderness Association, Salt Lake City, Utah

Utah Wildlife Federation, Salt Lake City, Utah  
 Utah Wildlife Leadership Coalition, West Valley  
 City, Utah  
 Washington County Water Conservation District,  
 St. George, Utah  
 Western Interstate Energy Board, Denver,  
 Colorado  
 Western River Guides Association, Flagstaff,  
 Arizona

Wilderness River Adventures, Page, Arizona  
 Wilderness Society, The, Washington, DC;  
 San Francisco, California; Santa Fe, New Mexico;  
 Phoenix, Arizona; Denver, Colorado  
 Wildlife Society, The, Bethesda, Maryland;  
 Western Section, Lakeview and Fresno, California;  
 Phoenix, Arizona; Reno, Nevada; Cedar City, Utah  
 Wyoming Municipal Power Agency, Lusk,  
 Wyoming  
 Wyoming Public Service Commission, Cheyenne,  
 Wyoming

Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District,  
 Yuma, Arizona  
 Y-W Electric Association, Inc., Akron, Colorado